THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, JULY, 1909

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Oregon, Washington, and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, 24 Concord Avenue, Cambridge.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women

Thirty-five Branch Committees; 14,549 members in 263 cities, towns, and villages.*

MRS. G. HOWLAND SHAW, President.
MRS. J. RANDOLPH COOLIDGE,
MISS ANNA L. DAWES,
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD,
MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS,
MISS AGNES IRWIN,
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY,
} Vice-Presidents.
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer, Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y, 24 Concord Avenue, Cambridge.

* *Net present membership of women over 21 years of age: eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations and removals from the State.*

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION.

THE annual meeting of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women was held at the home of Miss Ames, Dartmouth St., Boston, on Wednesday, May 5. Mrs. James M. Codman presided and, after the reading of the records of the last annual meeting by the Recording Secretary, Miss Johnson, gave a brief message of greeting from the President, Mrs. G. Howland Shaw, who was unable to be present; and spoke warmly of her great value to the Association, her thorough understanding of the subject and of her unfailing interest and devotion. Continuing, Mrs. Codman spoke of the work done during the past year, mentioning the formation of new Associations in Philadelphia and in Rhode Island, of a new society for the civic education of women in New York, of the great activity and success of the New York State Association and of the publication of a quarterly magazine, the Anti-Suffragist, by the Albany Association.

In Massachusetts, Mrs. Codman said, there had also been much hard work done with excellent results. The great event of the winter had been the hearing at the State House. As is well known the suffragists this year did not ask for Municipal or License or Tax Paying Suffrage, but made a comprehensive request for an amendment to the Constitution, by striking out the word *male*. But the Committee on Constitutional Amendments voted three in favor and eight against the proposed change. Then followed the debate, which resulted in a vote of 54 in favor and 171 against, an unusually decisive victory for the Anti-Suffrage cause. Mrs. Codman concluded by reading a few extracts from an English leaflet she had received from one of her English correspondents.

The Treasurer's Report was read and approved.

Miss Ames, Chairman of the Organization and Education Committees, read an interesting record of meetings held, literature distributed and other statistics, and Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Chairman of the Boston Committee, and Mrs. Frank Foxcroft, Chairman of the Cambridge Committee, spoke briefly, each showing much interest and progress.

The reading of the roll call followed and the meeting then proceeded to the election of officers for the coming year. The result was as follows:

President, Mrs. G. Howland Shaw; Vice Presidents, Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Charles D. Homans, Miss Agnes Irwin, Mrs. Henry M. Whitney; Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman, Brookline; Recording Secretary, Miss Elizabeth Johnson; Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong; Executive Committee, Miss Mary S. Ames, Mrs. M. L. Cate, Miss Sarah H. Crocker, Mrs. Gorham Dana, Mrs. F. L. Dodd, Miss Katharine E. Guild, Miss Elizabeth H. Houghton, Miss E. McCracken, Miss L. C. Post, Mrs. B. L. Robinson, Mrs. R. M. Saltonstall, Miss Elizabeth P. Sohier; Honorary Members of the Executive Committee, Mrs. James M. Crafts, Miss Sarah E. Hunt, Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, Mrs. Oliver W. Peabody, Mrs. Philip H. Sears, Mrs. Wm. T. Sedgwick, Mrs. Henry M. Thompson.

The regular business of the meeting being finished, Mrs. Codman introduced Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the New York State Association, who read a very interesting and instructive paper of which the following is a brief abstract:

A clever New York woman — an ardent suffragist, once remarked to a group of friends, "The Anti-suffragists make me think of Mrs. Partington trying to sweep back the ocean with a broom," whereupon another woman in the group replied, "Rather should I liken them to the little boy of Holland who held his hand over the hole in the dyck and thus kept his country from being inundated and destroyed by the inrushing ocean."

These two similes very aptly express the views of the two parties to this question of woman suffrage. Those who are in favor of it proclaim that it is coming and that nothing can stop it, while those who oppose it affirm on the contrary, that the more the question is studied and understood, the less chance there is of woman suffrage making any further gains in our Republic.

The truth is, that this whole question of woman suffrage is a larger and more serious question than many believe it to be. The fundamental principles of physiology, biology, sociol-

ogy and economics underlie it. It is closely interwoven with the basic principles of the evolution of life and their relation to higher civilization.

. . . . . .

I have found that there are two theories advanced by those who advocate woman suffrage which make an especially strong appeal to many women, but while these claims are specious they cannot be substantiated by facts.

The first claim is, that the working girl or woman who has been forced into a position of economic independence through the manifold industrial changes which have been developed in this country during the past sixty years, needs the ballot, not merely to insure an increase in her wages and control the conditions under which she works, but also as a symbol of her equality with the working man. Of course it is manifestly impossible for anyone to say with any absolute certainty that the ballot will or will not benefit the working woman. We must argue this question from analogy. If the ballot had raised *men's* wages there might be some justification for the belief that it would do the same for the working woman, but we all know that if a man could control his wages by means of a vote on election day, or determine in the same manner how many hours should constitute a working day, he would never have felt the necessity of organizing or joining trade unions or participating in strikes. It is the union organized in nearly every trade which has raised men's wages, not the ballot. The law of supply and demand is a controlling factor in the regulation of women's wages at the present day and will be just as long as there are more applicants for positions in factories and offices than there are available places and as long as women underbid men's labor. A certain proportion of women who do this are girls who go to business, as they call it, for a few years before they marry, either because they crave some excitement outside the daily routine life of home or wish to make some pin money to spend on their clothes, and are therefore willing to accept less than a living wage for their work. But even the girl who must support herself and others dependent upon her enters a factory or office with the idea, in nine cases out of ten, that she will only stay there until she marries. Two-thirds of the wage earning women in the United States cease to be wage earners at 35. Half cease to be wage earners at 25. It is this temporary nature of woman's work as well as the over supply of the market which affects her wages. Will giving woman the ballot change such economic conditions as these? The average age of the woman worker is between 18 and 22: more under the voting age than above it. Therefore but a small percentage of this class could vote even if the suffrage were given to women. How could such a small number as this effect any change in their conditions or wages by casting a ballot once a year?

The Anti-suffragist does not close her eyes to the fact that the road travelled by the woman wage earner is a hard one, and she welcomes such a decision as that rendered by the Supreme Court at Washington last spring which declared constitutional a law limiting the hours of woman's work in factories, because as the Mother of the race she had a right to such protection which the man working by her side did not possess; but she does not deceive herself with the vain belief that the ballot will raise the wages of her working sister nor improve her position as a worker, and therefore she opposes granting suffrage to all women on the ground that the working woman needs it.

The second claim made by those who advocate the extension of suffrage to women appeals very strongly to the woman who desires to be progressive. I refer to the theory that woman suffrage is in the direct line of woman's progress, and that those who oppose the one are impeding the other. The Anti-suffragists are accused of being obstructionists. We claim rather that we are constructive, for in the broad consideration of this question it is the present day tendency towards destructive principles we are opposing.

There is undeniable magic in the word progress, but before one jumps to the conclusion that woman suffrage is progress, one should carefully consider the true meaning of the term. All progress to be genuine must accord with natural laws, and the increasing tendency on the part of woman to assume the functions of man is at distinct variance with two natural laws. First the essential and intended difference in sex activity, and secondly the great law of evolution which teaches that the development of the race has been a continuous growth in specialization. The conservation of energy is a law of life. The demand that woman shall assume political responsibilities in addition to the great work Nature has already given her to do, is in direct opposition to this law, for it means a diffusion or weakening of her powers.

In savage life there is but little difference between the activities of the brave and his squaw, but as we ascend to higher types of civilization we find more subtle differences of nature and a more definite development of the respective functions of men and women. A recognition of this difference does not imply the superiority of one sex or the inferiority of the other. In this dualism of human life one supplies what the other lacks.

. . . . . .

One of the fundamental differences between the suffragist and Anti-suffragist as I see it is, that the former clings to the belief that the ballot in itself is a panacea for all existing evils and all powerful as a remedial agent of government, while the latter recognizes, in these opening years of the 20th Century, the development of a power more potent than the ballot — a power which at present we call educated or enlightened public opinion. The ballot hasn't solved our child labor problem and never will. The ballot hasn't solved the negro trouble, it has tended rather to complicate it, but an awakened public opinion has decreed that these problems and others akin to them shall be taken out of the realm of politics and be considered and dealt with from an economic and humanitarian point of view, and this is being done through the conferences and congresses on child labor, the care of dependent children, tuberculosis and other questions, which are being held throughout this country to-day. And in these conferences the woman's voice is heard equally with the man's. She isn't excluded from participation in such work because she hasn't a vote, neither is her influence lessened as a member of these committees for that reason. Here is a great field of activity and usefulness for woman, a real chance to serve the State.

I do not hesitate to say that those of us who are opposing the extension of suffrage to our sex entirely eliminate the personal element in our consideration of this subject. It is not a question of whether we want to vote or do not want to vote. We have the welfare and development of our country at heart and after a studious contemplation of the governmental principles involved, we are firmly con-

vinced that such "a revolutionary change" as Mr. Gladstone called woman suffrage, would be against the best interest of the State, its women and the home, and would be a step backward rather than one in advance.

A man in public life when interviewed this winter on the subject of woman suffrage said, "Somewhere within the borders of this country today there are mothers who are bringing up four Presidents, one hundred cabinet officers, three hundred Senators and five thousand representatives who between the years of 1930 and 1950 will be making the history of this country and measurably the history of the world. Woman can have her share in politics if she will. The ballot isn't all. The mere ballot she is so eager to clutch doesn't in the balance of politics count for more than an ounce in a ton."

Miss Chittenden was followed by Mr. Lawrence Lewis, formerly of Denver, who spoke on "Some Phases of Woman Suffrage in Colorado." No summary of this is given as it will be published in full later.

SUFFRAGE DEFEATS THIS YEAR.

THE April REMONSTRANCE gave a list of suffrage disappointments in the legislatures this year. The list included the defeat of proposed constitutional amendments in the legislatures of Massachusetts, California, Oklahoma, Iowa, Minnesota, and New York; of presidential suffrage bills in Kansas and Rhode Island, and of suffrage referendums in Iowa and Minnesota.

To this list of suffrage defeats the following additions are now to be recorded:

In Maine, the judiciary committee reported adversely upon a proposed constitutional amendment, and its report was accepted.

In New Hampshire, the House defeated a municipal suffrage bill by a vote of 86 to 115.

In Connecticut, a municipal suffrage bill was favorably reported but was defeated in the House by a viva voce vote.

In Arizona, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated.

In Wisconsin, a proposal to give women full suffrage provided that a referendum to be taken in 1910 should be in favor of it, passed the Senate but was defeated in the Assembly by a vote of 34 yeas to 53 nays.

In Illinois, the Billings municipal suffrage bill failed of passage in the Senate by a vote of 25 to 18, 26 votes being necessary for passage. A motion to reconsider was defeated, 22 to 21. By a vote of 19 to 16 the Senate refused to enact the Chicago charter suffrage bill.

In Missouri, the proposed suffrage amendment to the constitution was adversely reported and no attempt was made to reverse the action of the committee.

FORCING THE BALLOT ON WOMEN.

THE following considerations, urged by Mr. Frederic Harrison in the Anti-Suffrage Review of London, are as applicable in this country as in England:

Was there ever known an instance of a political franchise being forced on a class of persons who not only do not ask for it, but who vehemently repudiate and resist it? An active minority of women, thrusting themselves into public notoriety in season and out of season, certainly demand votes. But the immense majority of women remain unmoved, whilst large organized bodies of women, under the lead of women most eminent in every social and intellectual quality, strenuously protest against votes as an injury to their whole sex.

Mr. Gladstone once said that he had never heard of any extension of the franchise being given to any class which had not seriously demanded it. This is a perfectly sound view which must commend itself to all thoughtful statesmen. In every enlargement of the franchise area, in our own or in any Parliamentary country, some doubt may have arisen as to whether the new body to be enfranchised actively desired it as a whole. But did one ever hear of a new franchise being imposed on any body of men, large sections of whom organized themselves to resist it as a moral and social evil, and fought against it resolutely with every known political machinery? Yet this is what we see today. Women who are amongst the foremost of our age are devoting themselves earnestly with money, labor, and discipline to resist a cry which in their conscience they believe to be most mischievous to the State, and certain to lower the moral influence of women as a sex. If Parliament, in an hour of confusion or weakness, were to yield to the clamor of a noisy group, women would really have good ground to complain of the injury inflicted on them by "man-made" laws which they bitterly resented.

In the whole history of our Parliamentary representation for centuries has there ever been seen a case in which a class, whom it was proposed to enfranchise, carried on an organized opposition through the length and breadth of the country to repudiate it as mischievous both on public grounds and their own class interests? No legislature would ever dare to force on a franchise which was hateful to those to whom it was offered. Let members of Parliament who, in an easy mood, gave an academic assent to Mr. Mill, and at election time avoided facing a new worry, let them note the serious agitation now rising in resistance to Woman's Suffrage, let them note the strength of the petition signed against it, let them ask — who are the women leading the opposition and what is the social and intellectual authority they represent? Did they ever know of a political privilege so systematically repudiated by those to whom it was offered? And can they — even on Mr. Mill's doctrines, even on the principles of the Suffragists' own terms — can they as male legislators force a new law specially on woman, which the mass of women, and the best women, unite in condemning?

A DEFEAT IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

THE New Brunswick legislature had under consideration in April a bill which proposed to give votes in provincial elections to widows and spinsters owning property or having $400 annual income. Moderate as this bill was by comparison with most of the propositions introduced in legislatures in this country, it was rejected April 27 by a vote of 24 to 15.

QUEEN ALEXANDRA'S VIEWS

UNDER date of May 13th, the London correspondent of the *New York Times* cabled that journal as follows:

Queen Alexandra is evidently not in sympathy with the female suffragists. Princess Louise to-day opened the Women Nurses' Congress at Liverpool, and in a little speech said:

"I have a message for you from the Queen. She has the fullest sympathy with you in your work. She feels that this is the work which woman can do. Some women nowadays try to be like men, but this is the thing that men can't do, and it, therefore, is here that we feel superior to anybody else."

REMONSTRANTS OF ALL CLASSES.

IT is no more true in England than in this country that the women who remonstrate against woman suffrage and organize to resist it represent only the more fortunate classes,—those of wealth and leisure.

The great petition against the pending woman suffrage bill which was presented to the House of Commons last March, signed by 243,852 women, furnishes striking proof of this fact. On the first page were the signatures of a peeress, who is a widow and a large landowner, of a head-mistress of a high school, of a highly-educated workingwoman, of a librarian, of an author and of a wage-earner. In the petition, as a whole, were representatives of every trade and profession and occupation and walk in life: authors, journalists, schoolmistresses, farmers, shop-keepers, typists, clerks, domestic servants, mill hands, shop assistants, fishwives, coastguards' wives, soldiers' and sailors' wives, charwomen and caretakers.

The list of members of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women is equally representative of all classes of women,—taxpayers, journalists, teachers, domestic servants, clerks, librarians, all classes of wage-earners, women sheltered in homes of their own, and women engaged in a hard struggle for daily bread through manual or intellectual labor.

NO PROGRESS IN NEW ENGLAND.

THE records of legislative action in the New England states afford no encouragement to the suffragists. There is no evidence anywhere that the recent noisier activities of the suffrage leaders have produced the slightest favorable impression. Where any change appears it goes to show that the suffrage movement is losing rather than gaining ground.

In Massachusetts the proposed constitutional amendment was defeated by the heaviest majority for fifty years. In Maine, the adverse report of the committee was accepted without dissent. In New Hampshire, the proposed municipal suffrage bill was defeated by a decisive vote in the House and was not voted on in the Senate. In Connecticut, where in 1907, the House gave 56 votes in favor of a municipal suffrage bill, a similar proposition was defeated in the House this year by a viva voce vote, amid laughter. In Rhode Island, where the House in 1906 passed a presidential suffrage bill, the same branch this year defeated a similar bill by a unanimous vote. In Vermont, where in 1906 the House actually passed a municipal suffrage bill by a vote of 130 to 25, a corresponding bill at the last session was defeated in the Senate and was not voted on in the House.

It requires an extremely cheerful optimist to detect anything encouraging to the suffrage movement in these figures.

AS ONE WORKING-WOMAN SEES IT.

I AM an anti-suffragist because:

First—I have never heard a single argument advanced for the cause of suffrage that seemed to me convincing.

Second—I believe that women in politics would be a sorry sight. I do not say that woman's only sphere is the home. I know better. But it is not in the political arena. Women are not calculated by nature for the duties that the franchise would entail. Neither physically nor temperamentally are they strong enough for the fray.

They are—I am not speaking of exceptions—emotional and hysterical, as witness Mrs. Florence Kelly, one of the leaders of the suffragists, who shook her fist at the opposing women last Wednesday at Albany and called them "shameless women" who hid behind the shelter of their homes and shirked their responsibilities by trying to keep the ballot from other women. "Shame on you, every one," she shouted, flinging her arms in the air as she walked to her seat amid the applause of her fellow-suffragists. And for emotion, do you need any further illustration than the tearful appeal of Miss Leonora O'Reilly to the committee on the same occasion?

Third—I resent the assumption of the suffragists that they represent the working woman and that they are her best friends. They do represent a large element of the working women, but not all; nor are they her best friends. They believe that they are, no doubt; but I believe that they are her worst enemies, because they teach her discontent and hold out golden hopes to her that can never be realized.

Fourth—I am just as much of a working woman as Mrs. Kelly or Miss O'Reilly. I began at 14, and have been at it ever since, and expect to be at it till I die. I have worked hard and had as many responsibilities and discouragements as though I had rolled cigars in a factory or worked at a loom in a mill, and I have just as much right to speak for the working woman as have they; and I wish to say right here, as I have said elsewhere, that I cannot see that the ballot would have helped me one iota in getting on in the world or have made the rough places smooth.

Fifth—I believe not only that the ballot in the hands of women would be a calamity, but I believe that it would prove a boomerang.—*Miss Jeannette L. Gilder in The New York Times.*